

# Online Classification with Complex Metrics

Bowei Yan<sup>1</sup>, Oluwasanmi Koyejo<sup>2</sup>, Kai Zhong<sup>1</sup>, and Pradeep Ravikumar<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Texas at Austin

<sup>2</sup>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

<sup>3</sup>Carnegie Mellon University

October 25, 2016

## Abstract

We present a framework and analysis of consistent binary classification for complex and non-decomposable performance metrics such as the F-measure and the Jaccard measure. The proposed framework is general, as it applies to both batch and online learning, and to both linear and non-linear models. Our work follows recent results showing that the Bayes optimal classifier for many complex metrics is given by a thresholding of the conditional probability of the positive class. This manuscript extends this thresholding characterization – showing that the utility is strictly locally quasi-concave with respect to the threshold for a wide range of models and performance metrics. This, in turn, motivates simple normalized gradient ascent updates for threshold estimation. We present a finite-sample regret analysis for the resulting procedure. In particular, the risk for the batch case converges to the Bayes risk at the same rate as that of the underlying conditional probability estimation, and the risk of proposed online algorithm converges at a rate that depends on the conditional probability estimation risk. For instance, in the special case where the conditional probability model is logistic regression, our procedure achieves  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$  sample complexity, both for batch and online training. Empirical evaluation shows that the proposed algorithms out-perform alternatives in practice, with comparable or better prediction performance and reduced run time for various metrics and datasets.

## 1 Introduction

Binary classification is perhaps *the* classical problem in machine learning, with a large literature and wide ranging applications. While maximization of the accuracy metric has been a strong focus of theory and practice, practitioners in applied areas such as medical diagnosis, information retrieval and other problems with severely imbalanced classes, often apply more complex performance metrics that capture important non-linear trade-offs.

These complex classification performance metrics include non-decomposable measures such as the F-measure (Manning et al., 2008) and Harmonic Mean (Kennedy et al., 2009) – metrics which are not optimized by standard application of classical techniques. This practical reality has motivated research into novel effective and efficient algorithms tailored to complex (non-decomposable) metrics. It is especially hard to design online algorithms for such problems due to the non-continuity and non-decomposability nature of the loss function.

Recent work has shown that for many complex performance metrics, the Bayes optimal classifier is a threshold function of the conditional probability of the positive class (Koyejo et al., 2014; Narasimhan et al., 2014), which has motivated a simple **two-step plugin** estimator described as follows: (*Step 1*) conditional probability estimation, followed by (*Step 2*) threshold estimation. The first step – conditional probability estimation is a standard learning problem which has been studied by lots of researchers. It can be addressed using logistic regression, neural networks or other techniques, with many efficient, scalable

algorithms (Husmeier, 2012; Beygelzimer et al., 2009). On the other hand, threshold estimation is a more recent problem that has not yet received much attention, despite the fact that it’s the most important piece that distinguishes the solution of complex metric from that of 0-1 loss.

For many complex measures of interest, the optimal threshold depends on the oracle classifier (Koyejo et al., 2014) and cannot be computed directly. Instead, Koyejo et al. (2014) propose an exhaustive search over all data samples, and show that the resulting algorithm is consistent. However, the exact search depends on the sampling procedure which makes the sample complexity convergence hard to characterize (Koyejo et al. (2014) didn’t provide any convergence rate guarantees). More importantly, the exact search requires the knowledge of all data samples and doesn’t easily generalize to streaming data. This reveals the need for computationally efficient alternatives with stronger theoretical guarantees.

Another line of work focuses on surrogate based approaches (Joachims et al., 2009; Kar et al., 2014), which involve the construction of convex surrogates of the performance metric. However, the resulting optimization problems typically have an exponential number of constraints, so that approaches to solve these either do not scale well to very large scale datasets, or generally have few statistical guarantees with respect to the optimal classifier. Most of such approaches only optimize over the family of linear classifiers, which further restricts the applicability of the classifiers for more complex data generating models.

Beyond batch learning methods, several authors have proposed online algorithms for optimal classification with complex performance measures. Kar et al. (2014) proposed an online gradient descent algorithm based on a convex surrogate. The proposed algorithm uses mini-batch updates, and requires maintaining a large buffer to compute online gradient estimates. In practice, these updates are prohibitively computationally expensive. Recently, Narasimhan et al. (2015) proposed a stochastic gradient method to solve for feasible elements of the confusion matrix directly. Their approach involves a linearization of classification metric which, in turn, enables the construction of point-wise stochastic gradient descent (SGD) updates. They provide algorithms for optimizing both fractional-linear metrics (Koyejo et al., 2014) and concave metrics (Narasimhan et al., 2014), showing theoretical convergence guarantees. A key assumption in this paper is the classifier being linear. Witnessing the recent success of non-linear classification such as deep neural networks, the linearity assumption might seem too restrictive for large scale classification problems. Also their method is not designed for sparse high dimensional applications, which again narrows the scope of its application.

With wide-spread used in information retrieval and related areas, perhaps the most studied non-decomposable performance metric is the F-measure (Nan et al., 2012; Joachims, 2005; Zhao et al., 2013). As such, researchers have developed tailored batch algorithms Nan et al. (2012); Joachims (2005) as well as risk bounds Zhao et al. (2013). Busa-Fekete et al. (2015) proposes a scalable and effective online F-measure algorithm for large datasets. The update is based on a similar two-step approach as the batch plug-in, with online updates for the conditional probability, and a novel root finding algorithm for the threshold update which exploits special properties of the F-measure. Unfortunately, this root finding technique is not easily extended to other complex performance metrics.

## 1.1 Our contributions

This paper proposes two novel algorithms for classification with complex performance metrics, where the utility can be represented as a function of confusion matrix, covering both fractional-linear metrics (Koyejo et al., 2014) and concave metrics (Narasimhan et al., 2014). Our key insight follows from an explicit characterization of the optimal threshold, which is known for fractional-linear metrics (Koyejo et al., 2014), but to the best of our knowledge has not been characterized for other monotonic metrics.

Our core generative assumption is on the conditional probability – that it’s continuous, differentiable and light-tailed (these notions will be formally defined in Section 3). This generative assumption is quite broad, and covers a wide range of generative models. As a popular class of discriminative models used in practice, we discuss linear discriminant analysis with conditional Gaussian models as a special case, which is usually solved by logistic regression in practice.

We use normalized gradient ascent to optimize the threshold. This simple idea naturally generalizes to online settings, where one only needs to keep track of a running confusion matrix and calculate the gradient from there without storage of all previous data.

We analyze the finite sample regret bound for both methods, i.e. the difference in utility with an finite-sample estimator, assuming the regret for the selected conditional probability estimator (CPE) machine is known. We show that by changing the loss to general metrics, the convergence rate of batch scenarios is not sacrificed, and for online scenarios the rate is the accumulate sum of that of the chosen online CPE machine. It's worth noting that we have very few assumptions on the form of conditional probability estimator as long as it is consistent, which suggests our proposed method can be easily combined with any CPE solver with minimal effort. Taking logistic regression as a concrete example, we achieve a rate of  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$  in both batch and online settings, the same rate also holds for regularized logistic regression in the high dimensional setting.

In summary, we consider optimal classification for complex performance measures. Our main contributions are as follows:

1. We characterize the optimal threshold for monotonic metrics under mild conditions and show that under certain conditions, the classification utilities are locally quasi-concave with respect to the threshold.
2. We propose a provably convergent normalized gradient ascent algorithm for solving the optimal threshold, and we present a finite-sample regret bound with any given CPE machine.
3. We propose a scalable online algorithm which again can be easily combined with any given online CPE machine, we prove its consistency and a finite-sample regret bound.

Finally, we provide an extensive empirical evaluation for a range of metrics and datasets which highlight the scalability and out-of-sample performance of the proposed techniques for both low and high dimensional scenarios.

The paper is organized as below. In Section 2 we introduce the problem and notations. The characterization and properties of Bayes optimal classifier is derived in Section 3. We propose the algorithms and analyze the consistency and regret bound in Section 4. A special case of logistic regression is discussed in Section 5 where explicit convergence rate is given. We conclude the paper in Section 7. Due to the space limit, we defer all discussions about experimental results in Appendix F. All proofs are deferred to the Appendix as well.

## 2 Problem Setup and Preliminaries

Binary classification involves predicting the label  $Y \in \{\pm 1\}$  associated with a given instance  $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . This is achieved using a binary classifier, which is a function mapping from the instances to the labels as  $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \{\pm 1\}$ . Let  $\Theta = \{f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \{\pm 1\}\}$  denote the set of classifiers. We assume  $(X, Y)$  are governed by the probability law  $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$ . Let  $\eta(x) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X = x)$  and  $\pi := \mathbb{P}(Y = 1)$ .

**Definition 1** (Confusion Matrix). *For any classifier  $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \{\pm 1\}$ , the elements of confusion matrix are:*

$$\begin{aligned} TP(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = +1, f(X) = +1), \\ FP(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = -1, f(X) = +1), \\ FN(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = +1, f(X) = -1), \\ TN(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = -1, f(X) = -1) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

*It is clear that that for any  $f \in \Theta$ ,  $TP(f) + FN(f) = \pi$ ,  $FP(f) + TN(f) = 1 - \pi$ .*

Without loss of generality, we define a performance metric as a utility metric  $\mathcal{U} : \Theta \times \mathcal{P} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ . The Bayes optimal classifier with respect to  $\mathcal{U}$  is argument which optimizes  $\mathcal{U}$ :

$$f_{\mathcal{U}}^* = \arg \max_f \mathcal{U}(f) \tag{2}$$

And when it's clear from context, we use  $TP^*, TN^*$  to denote  $TP(f_{\mathcal{U}}^*), TN(f_{\mathcal{U}}^*)$ . In this paper, we focus on complex binary classification metrics that can be expressed as functions of the confusion matrix elements. From Definition 1 it is clear that there are only two degrees of freedom in the confusion matrix, so there always exists a two-parameter representation for  $\mathcal{U}$  as  $\mathcal{G}$ . Formally we have the following assumptions on the utility function.

**Assumption 1.** *The utility  $\mathcal{U}$  satisfies the following properties: (A1.1) The utility can be represented as a function of TP and TN, i.e.,  $\mathcal{U}(f) = \mathcal{G}(TP, TN)$ , where  $\mathcal{G}$  is continuous and differentiable. (A1.2) Let the gradient of  $\mathcal{G}(\cdot, \cdot)$  be  $\nabla \mathcal{G} = [g_1, g_2]^T$ , assume  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are continuous, non-negative in  $[0, 1]^2$  and are strictly positive on the boundary.*

The continuity assumption is standard in such problems (see for example Narasimhan et al. (2014)). The monotonicity assumption is natural in that when one quantity of the TP, TN is fixed, it's always more favorable for any classifier to have the other one higher. The above assumption covers a broad family of commonly used metrics such as F-measure, and any metrics defined by averaging the true positive and true negative, such as G-Mean and H-Mean to name just a few.

### 3 The Bayes optimum

In this section we characterize the Bayes optimal of the general classification problem as a thresholding function of the conditional probability. Then we show the utility, as a function of the threshold, is quasi-concave, and hence under regularity conditions the threshold is unique.

It is well known that when instances are generated from a Gaussian mixture model, the Bayes optimal classifier under the accuracy metric is a linear discriminant function (Ng and Jordan, 2002), equivalent to a thresholding of the conditional probability at  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Recent work has shown that the optimal classifiers for monotonic and linear-fractional performance metrics are also threshold functions (Koyejo et al., 2014; Narasimhan et al., 2014, 2015), but with a metric dependent threshold. While Koyejo et al. (2014) explicitly characterize the threshold for linear fractional metrics, Narasimhan et al. (2014, 2015) show that the optimal classifier has the threshold form without an explicit characterization. Our first result generalizes the characterization of (Koyejo et al., 2014) to monotonic metrics, showing that the optimal threshold takes the **same parametric form** as the linear fractional case, when the probability mass at the optimal point is 0.

**Theorem 1** (Bayes Optimal as a thresholding function). *Assume  $\mathcal{U}$  be a performance metric satisfying Assumption 1 and  $g_1(TP^*, TN^*) + g_2(TP^*, TN^*) \neq 0$ . Let  $\delta^* = \frac{g_2(TP^*, TN^*)}{g_1(TP^*, TN^*) + g_2(TP^*, TN^*)}$ , if  $\mathbb{P}(\eta(X) = \delta^*) = 0$ , then the Bayes optimal classifier  $f_{\mathcal{U}}^*$  satisfies:*

$$f_{\mathcal{U}}^*(x) = \text{sign}(\eta(x) - \delta^*) \quad \text{a.e.} \quad (3)$$

**Remark 1.** *When  $\mathbb{P}(\eta(X) = \delta^*) > 0$ , we may not be able to deterministically define the optimal value of the classifier on set  $\{X : \eta(X) = \delta^*\}$ . Our simulations suggest that in such cases, the optimal is achieved by a randomized classifier. As this discussion is beyond the scope of this paper, for simplicity, we assume for the rest of the paper  $\mathbb{P}(\eta(X) = \delta^*) = 0$ .*

#### 3.1 Solving the optimal threshold

We analyze the Bayes optimal classifier of Theorem 1 based on its two components, i.e. the conditional probability and the threshold. Estimators for conditional probability  $\eta$  are well studied in the literature (Buja et al., 2005; Narasimhan and Agarwal, 2013), both in theory and practice. Thus we are free to focus on optimal threshold estimation. In particular, we bound the regret of the overall procedure based on the regret of the underlying conditional probability estimator, which we consider as a black box.

The utility  $\mathcal{U}$  is neither convex or concave in general as a function of the threshold. Furthermore, the objective function can be very flat around the optimal points, yet when TP, TN are very close to the boundary (0 or 1), some of the metrics become ill-conditioned (e.g. H-Mean). These issues increase the difficulty of analysis and fails the classical gradient descent method. Nevertheless, we will show that under mild conditions, the metrics of interest are quasi-concave. Thus, the negative gradient is a global ascent direction, and the global minimum is unique. We will formally define the family of Quasi-Convex functions in Subsection 3.2, and show that  $\mathcal{U}$  is strictly locally quasi-concave. Then in Section 4 we propose Normalized Gradient Descent to circumvent the plateaus and sharp cliffs.

### 3.2 Quasi Convexity

**Definition 2** (Locally-Lipshitzness). Let  $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $G, \epsilon \geq 0$ . A function  $f : \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is called  $L$ -Locally-Lipshitz in set  $B$  if for every  $x, y \in B$ , we have

$$|f(x) - f(y)| \leq L\|x - y\|.$$

**Definition 3** (Quasi-Convexity). A function  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is quasi-convex if  $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , such that  $f(y) \leq f(x)$ , it follows that  $\langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \leq 0$ . We further say that  $f$  is strictly quasi-convex, if it is quasi-convex and its gradient vanishes only at the global minima, i.e.,  $f(y) > \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x) \Rightarrow \|\nabla f(y)\| > 0$ .  $f$  is called (strictly) quasi-concave if  $-f$  is (strictly) quasi-convex.

**Definition 4** (Strictly-Locally-Quasi-Convex). Let  $x, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\kappa, \epsilon > 0$ . We say that  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is  $(\epsilon, \kappa, z)$ -Strictly-Locally-Quasi-Convex (SLQC) in  $x$ , if at least one of the following applies:

1.  $f(x) - f(z) \leq \epsilon$ .
2.  $\|\nabla f(x)\| > 0$ , and for every  $y \in B(z, \epsilon/\kappa)$  it holds that  $\langle \nabla f(x), y - x \rangle \leq 0$ .

Hazan et al. (2015) shows the convergence of normalized gradient descent of SLQC functions by the following theorem.

**Lemma 1** (Convergence of NGD (Hazan et al., 2015)). Fix  $\epsilon > 0$ , let  $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , and  $x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} f(x)$ . Given that  $f$  is  $(\epsilon, \kappa, x^*)$ -SLQC in every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Then running the NGD algorithm with number of iterations  $T \geq \kappa^2 \|x_1 - x^*\|^2 / \epsilon^2$  and stepsize  $\eta = \epsilon/\kappa$ , we have that  $f(\bar{x}_T) - f(x^*) \leq \epsilon$ .

On the other hand, for data generating distribution, the probability mass of  $\eta(X)$  around the optimal threshold should be strictly positive, such that any changes in the threshold can be reflected sufficiently by sampling  $X$ . We continue by introducing the assumptions on the data generating distribution.

**Assumption 2.**  $\mathbb{P}(X, Y)$  satisfies: (A2.1)  $\eta(X) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1|X)$  is continuous and differentiable; (A2.2) Assume  $Z = \eta(X)$  and its characteristic function  $\phi_1(t)$  is absolutely integrable, in particular,  $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\phi_1(t)| dt := K < \infty$ .

As we define  $f^*$  by a thresholding function of  $\eta$ , Assumption (A2.1) ensures the classifier is continuous except around the threshold. Assumption (A2.2) is crucial to ensure the fact that when two conditional probabilities are close, then thresholding them with the same threshold would not incur much difference. We'll have more discussion about this assumption after we introduce the main result. These assumptions are quite general, and are satisfied, for instance by a generalized linear model with smooth link function and Gaussian covariates.

With Assumption 2, we are now able to characterize the gradient of the utility with respect to the threshold.

**Lemma 2.** If  $\mathbb{P}(X, Y)$  satisfies Assumption 2, and  $\mathcal{U}$  satisfies Assumption 1, then for any threshold classifier  $f(x) = \text{sign}(\eta(x) - \delta)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(f)$  are differentiable w.r.t.  $\delta$ , and

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{U}(f)}{\partial \delta} = (-\delta g_1(TP, TN) + (1 - \delta)g_2(TP, TN)) p_\eta(\delta). \quad (4)$$

Based on Lemma 2, we are ready to show that  $\mathcal{U}$ , although not concave, is strictly locally quasi-concave with respect to the threshold.

**Lemma 3.** If  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfy Assumption 1, then there exists  $\rho_0 \in (0, 1/2]$  such that  $\nabla \mathcal{U}(\delta) > 0$  for  $\delta \in [0, \rho_0)$  and  $\nabla \mathcal{U}(\delta) < 0$  for  $\delta \in (1 - \rho_0, 1]$ . Moreover,  $\delta^* \in [\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]$ . Let  $M = \sup_{\delta \in [\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]} \{g_1(\delta), g_2(\delta)\}$ ,  $\mathcal{U}(\delta)$  is  $\frac{KM}{2\pi}$ -Lipschitz in  $[\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]$ , and  $\mathcal{U}(\delta)|_{[\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]}$  is  $(\epsilon, \frac{KM}{2\pi}, \delta^*)$ -SLQC for any  $\epsilon > 0$ .

## 4 Main Results

As we show in Section 3, the objective is quasi-concave in terms of the threshold. To circumvent the plateaus and sharp cliffs, one can normalize the gradient such that the algorithm will converge despite the extreme situations in the scale of the gradient. In this section we present our algorithms based on Normalized Gradient Descent and analyze their convergence property as well as the finite sample regret bound.

### 4.1 Batch Algorithm

We present the batch algorithm in Algorithm 1. The analysis is given in Subsection 4.2.

---

**Algorithm 1** Two Step Normalized Gradient Descent for optimal threshold search

---

- 1: **Input:** Training sample  $\{X_i, Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ , utility measure  $\mathcal{U}$ , conditional probability estimator  $\hat{\eta}$ , stepsize  $\alpha$ .
  - 2: Randomly split the training sample into two subsets  $\{X_i^{(1)}, Y_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$  and  $\{X_i^{(2)}, Y_i^{(2)}\}_{i=1}^{n_2}$ ;
  - 3: Estimate  $\hat{\eta}$  on  $\{X_i^{(1)}, Y_i^{(1)}\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$ .
  - 4: Initialize  $\delta = 0.5$ ;
  - 5: **while** not converged **do**
  - 6:   Evaluate TP, TN on  $\{X_i^{(2)}, Y_i^{(2)}\}_{i=1}^{n_2}$  with  $f(x) = \text{sign}(\hat{\eta} - \delta)$ .
  - 7:   Calculate  $\nabla \mathcal{U}$  with (4);
  - 8:    $\delta \leftarrow \delta - \alpha \frac{\nabla \mathcal{U}}{\|\nabla \mathcal{U}\|}$ .
  - 9: **end while**
  - 10: **Output:**  $\hat{f}(x) = \text{sign}(\hat{\eta} - \delta)$ .
- 

The complexity of Algorithm 1 is the sum of two stages. The complexity for first step is usually greater than  $\Omega(n)$ . In the second stage, each step requires an evaluation for TP and TN and has a  $O(n)$  complexity. The total complexity for NGD is  $O(nt) = O(n/\epsilon^2)$ , where  $t$  is the number of iterations and  $\epsilon$  is the precision of the solution.

In contrast, exhaustive search computes the utility at each potential threshold (the conditional probability at each sample point), an estimate of the confusion matrix is evaluated with  $O(n)$  computational complexity. Thus, the total computational cost is  $O(n^2)$ . With pre-sorted conditional probabilities, the computational cost of the utility evaluation may be reduced to  $O(n)$  and the initial sorting complexity of  $O(n \log n)$  will dominate. When  $\log n \geq 1/\epsilon^2$ , the batch algorithm has favorable computational complexity as compared to threshold search for large  $n$ .

More importantly, the gradient now has explicit dependency on the confusion matrix, therefore we know how it changes when TP and TN change as we update the conditional probability estimation in the iterations. This intuition helps us develop the following regret analysis, and we will see how it helps when we extend the idea to the online regime.

### 4.2 Consistency

Denote the classifier output by Algorithm 1 as  $f_{\text{Alg1}}$ , and the corresponding utility  $\mathcal{U}(f_{\text{Alg1}})$  as  $\mathcal{U}_{\text{Alg1}}$ . The following result states that when the CPE is consistent, the utility converges to  $\mathcal{U}^*$  at the same rate as  $\hat{\eta}$  converges to  $\eta$ .

**Theorem 2** (Regret bound of batch algorithm). *Let  $\mathcal{G}$  satisfy Assumption 1 and is  $L$ -Locally-Lipschitz in the neighborhood of  $TP^*, TN^*$ . Let the first step conditional probability estimation  $\hat{\eta}$  satisfy that its characteristic function is absolutely integrable. If  $f$  is the output of Algorithm 1 with stepsize  $\alpha \leq \frac{2\pi \int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu}{KM}$  and number of iterations  $T \geq \frac{K^2 M^2}{16\pi \int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu}$ . Then  $\mathcal{U}^* - \mathcal{U}(f) \leq C \int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu$ .*

The regret consists of two parts, one by error in  $\delta$  and the other by error in  $\eta$ . The first part can be bounded by the convergence guarantee of NGD. For the second part, as the metric  $\mathcal{G}$  is locally Lipschitz, the

key is to show that TP and TN estimated from the algorithm lie close to the optimal ones. The second step is non-trivial in that the integral region for TP and TN is different from those of the optimal TP\* and TN\*. We defer the full proof in Appendix C.

### 4.3 Online algorithm

Faced with large amounts of data, practitioners typically prefer algorithms that process each observation only once. However, despite the development of online classification approaches under 0-1 loss, the problem for general metrics remains largely open due to several reasons. The biggest barricade is the undecomposability of the utility, most of the theoretical analysis for stochastic gradient method requires the loss function taking the form of sum of individual losses on each sample point. This is not met by the structure of general performance metrics. Existing methods Busa-Fekete et al. (2015); Narasimhan et al. (2015) depend strongly on the specific structure of the metrics or linearity of the optimal classifier, and are not easily extensible to broader class of problems.

However, our analysis in Section 3 suggests that the threshold can be learned given a good estimator of conditional probability, and we know there exist online algorithms for conditional probability estimations. Therefore we propose Algorithm 2 where in the outer loop one updates the conditional probability in an online manner, and in the inner loop, one optimizes the threshold by NGD similar as Algorithm 1. We show its consistency in Theorem 3, and that we could achieve the same convergence rate as any classic classification problems without much sacrifice in run time. The proposed method can be easily combined with existing binary classification solvers including logistic regression, neural networks and Bayesian models with minimal effort, and achieve the state-of-the-art performance.

---

#### Algorithm 2 Online Complex Metric Optimization (OCMO)

---

**Require:** An online CPE machine with updating rule  $g$ , performance metric  $\mathcal{U}$ , stepsize  $\alpha$ ;

- 1: Initilize  $\eta_0, \delta_0 = 0.5$ ;
  - 2: **while** data stream has points **do**
  - 3:   Receive data point  $(x_t, y_t)$
  - 4:    $\eta_t = g(\eta_{t-1})$ ;
  - 5:    $\delta_t^{(0)} = \delta_t, \text{TP}_t^{(0)} = \text{TP}_{t-1}, \text{TN}_t^{(0)} = \text{TN}_{t-1}$ ;
  - 6:   **for**  $i = 1, \dots, T_t$  **do**
  - 7:     **if**  $\eta_t(x_t) > \delta_t^{(i-1)}$  **then**
  - 8:        $\text{TP}_t^{(i)} \leftarrow \frac{\text{TP}_{t-1} \cdot (t-1) + (1+y_t)/2}{t}, \text{TN}_t^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{TN}_{t-1} \cdot \frac{t-1}{t}$ ;
  - 9:     **else**  $\text{TP}_t^{(i)} \leftarrow \text{TP}_{t-1} \cdot \frac{t-1}{t}, \text{TN}_t^{(i)} \leftarrow \frac{\text{TN}_{t-1} \cdot t + (1-y_t)/2}{t+1}$ ;
  - 10:    **end if**
  - 11:     $\delta_t^{(i)} = \delta_t^{(i-1)} - \alpha \frac{\nabla \mathcal{G}(\text{TP}_t, \text{TN}_t)}{\|\nabla \mathcal{G}(\text{TP}_t, \text{TN}_t)\|}, \text{TP}_t = \text{TP}_t^{(i)}, \text{TN}_t = \text{TN}_t^{(i)}$ ;
  - 12:   **end for**
  - 13:    $\delta_{t+1} = \delta_t^{(T_t)}$ ;
  - 14:    $t = t + 1$ ;
  - 15: **end while**
  - 16: Output  $(\eta_t, \delta_t)$ .
- 

**Theorem 3** (Regret bound of online algorithm (OCMO)). *If a consistent CPE machine  $g$  is given, with error at step  $t$  defined as  $r_t = \int |\eta_t - \eta| d\mu$ . Then running Algorithm 2 inner number of iterations  $T_t \geq \frac{K^2 M^2}{16\pi r_t^2}$  and stepsize  $\alpha = \frac{2\pi\epsilon}{KM}$ , then we have,  $\mathcal{U}^* - \mathcal{U}(\eta_t, \delta_t) \leq \frac{C \sum_{i=1}^t r_i}{t}$ .*

The key idea is to bound the distance between true TP and running  $\text{TP}_t$ , and the same for TN. We do this by writing it into an average of distance at each step. The concentration of  $\delta$  is similar in the proof of Theorem 2. We defer the full proof to Appendix D.

Table 1: Description of data sets.

| DATASETS   | DEFAULT | NEWS20    | RCV1    | EPSILON | KDDA       | KDDB       |
|------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|------------|------------|
| # FEATURES | 25      | 1,355,191 | 47,236  | 2,000   | 20,216,830 | 29,890,095 |
| # TEST     | 9,000   | 4,996     | 677,399 | 100,000 | 510,302    | 748,401    |
| # TRAIN    | 21,000  | 15,000    | 20,242  | 400,000 | 8,407,752  | 19,264,097 |
| %POS       | 22%     | 67%       | 52%     | 50%     | 85%        | 86%        |

Table 2: Performance and computational time (of second step) for Algorithm 1.

| DATA SET/METRIC | LR+PLUG-IN     | LR+ALG 1        | XGB+PLUG-IN    | XGB+ALG 1       |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| NEWS20-Q-MEAN   | 0.948 (3.77 s) | 0.948 (0.001 s) | 0.874 (3.87 s) | 0.875 (0.003 s) |
| NEWS20-H-MEAN   | 0.950 (3.70 s) | 0.950 (0.003 s) | 0.859 (3.61 s) | 0.860 (0.003 s) |
| NEWS20-F1       | 0.949 (3.49 s) | 0.948 (0.01 s)  | 0.872 (5.07 s) | 0.874 (0.01 s)  |
| DEFAULT-Q-MEAN  | 0.664 (14.3 s) | 0.667 (0.19 s)  | 0.688 (13.7 s) | 0.701 (0.22 s)  |
| DEFAULT-H-MEAN  | 0.665 (12.1 s) | 0.668 (0.17 s)  | 0.693 (12.4 s) | 0.708 (0.18 s)  |
| DEFAULT-F1      | 0.503 (14.2 s) | 0.497 (0.19 s)  | 0.538 (16.2 s) | 0.538 (0.15 s)  |

As special cases, when  $r_t = O(\frac{1}{n})$ , then Algorithm 2 converges at rate  $O(\frac{\log n}{n})$ ; when  $r_t = O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ , then Algorithm 2 converges at rate  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ ; when  $r_t = O(\frac{1}{n^2})$ , then Algorithm 2 converges at rate  $O(\frac{1}{n})$ .

**Remark 2.** *One potential drawback is the number of iterations for the inner loop will increase as the required accuracy for  $\delta$  increases. In practice, as we also observed in the experiments, one can set  $T_t$  as constant and solve the subproblem inexactly and achieve reasonably good result.*

## 5 Analysis for Logistic Regression

Logistic regression is a classic method in binary classification and plays a crucial role in numerous statistical and machine learning problems. Formally, the conditional probability has the form  $f(y|X) = 1/(1 + \exp(-y\langle X, \beta \rangle))$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is the Euclidean inner product. Here we discuss some corollary results where the proposed approach is applied to logistic regression. Combined with existing algorithms on parameter estimation, we provide explicit convergence rates for general classification problems.

An important property about logistic regression is that it restricts the optimal classifier in the linear discriminant function family, which is computationally favorable and more interpretable.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{U}$  satisfy Assumption 1, and  $(X, Y)$  is generated from logistic regression model with parameter  $\beta$ , then the Bayes optimal classifier is linear discriminant:  $f_{\mathcal{U}}^*(x) = \text{sign}\left(\langle \beta, x \rangle - \log\left(\frac{\delta^*}{1-\delta^*}\right)\right)$ .*

Lemma 4 follows from a direct application of Theorem 1. We then show in the following Lemma that the  $\ell_1$  distance between  $\eta(X)$  and  $\hat{\eta}(X)$  is upper bounded by the distance between  $\beta$  and its estimator, up to a constant. For ease of notation, we use  $\eta_\beta$  to represent the conditional probability induced by parameter  $\beta$ .

**Lemma 5.** *If  $(X, Y)$  is generated from logistic model,  $EX < \infty$ .  $\hat{\beta}$  is an estimator of  $\beta$  where  $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\| \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\int_X |\eta_{\hat{\beta}}(x) - \eta_\beta(x)| d\mu(x) = O(\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|)$ .*

Lemma 5 states that our proposed algorithms could benefit from any faster convergence rate for parameter estimations of logistic regression. We illustrate this in three useful scenarios: ordinary logistic regression; regularized logistic regression and online algorithm for logistic regression. We will not go into details since the related work is somewhat involved and tangent to the current paper. We refer the interested reader to the corresponding references for the exact conditions and implementations.

Table 3: Performance and computational time for online algorithms on various data sets.

| Metric | Algorithm           | RCV1           | EPSILON         | KDD-A          | KDD-B         |
|--------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| F1     | OCMO                | 0.952 (0.01s)  | 0.804 (4.87s)   | 0.934 (2.43s)  | 0.941 (5.01s) |
|        | STAMP               | 0.923 (14.44s) | 0.585 (133.23s) | - <sup>a</sup> | -             |
|        | SVM <sup>PERF</sup> | 0.953 (1.72 s) | 0.872 (20.39 s) | -              | -             |
| H-MEAN | OCMO                | 0.964 (0.02s)  | 0.891 (4.85s)   | 0.764 (2.5s)   | 0.733 (5.16s) |
|        | SPADE               | 0.580 (15.74s) | 0.578 (135.26s) | -              | -             |
|        | SVM <sup>PERF</sup> | 0.953 (1.72 s) | 0.872 (20.39 s) | -              | -             |
| Q-MEAN | OCMO                | 0.964 (0.01s)  | 0.889 (4.87s)   | 0.551 (2.11s)  | 0.506 (4.27s) |
|        | SPADE               | 0.688 (15.83s) | 0.632 (136.46s) | -              | -             |
|        | SVM <sup>PERF</sup> | 0.950 (1.72 s) | 0.872 (20.39 s) | -              | -             |

<sup>a</sup> ‘-’ means the corresponding algorithm does not terminate within 100x that of OCMO.




Figure 1: Performance vs run time for various online algorithms

**Example 1** (Ordinary logistic regression). *The asymptotic result on estimating the parameter for logistic regression has long been shown by Fahrmeir and Kaufmann (1985) with a sample complexity of  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ . Combining this result with Theorem 2 gives us a  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$  rate of convergence of regret by Algorithm 1.*

**Example 2** (Regularized logistic regression). *For high dimensional data ( $p \gg n$ ), the latent parameter is typically assumed sparse to enable robust classification. In optimization, a regularizer  $R(\beta)$  is added to the loss to encourage sparsity. This regularized  $M$ -estimation problem has been extensively studied (e.g., (Negahban et al., 2009)). Under regularity conditions, the  $\ell_2$  estimation error of the model parameter is upper bounded by  $O(\frac{s \log p}{n})$ . This, combined with Theorem 2 leads to a  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$  convergence of regret.*

**Example 3** (Online algorithm). *By averaged stochastic gradient algorithm, Bach (2014) shows that the parameter converges at rate  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ . Combined with Theorem 3, we have Algorithm 2 also converges at rate  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$ .*

## 6 Experimental results

In this section we present some numerical evaluations. Due to space limitation, we defer additional synthetic and online benchmark experimental results to Appendix F. A brief description of the datasets used in all experiments is given in Table 1. For both batch and online algorithms, we choose three performance metrics for comparison: Q-Mean, H-Mean and F-1 measure.

## 6.1 Batch algorithms

We report comparisons of the out-sample utility of Algorithm 1 on various metrics and two datasets, default (Yeh and Lien, 2009) and news20. In all experiments, we compare using logistic regression and boosting tree as the first step solvers, combined with plug-in or Algorithm 1 for the threshold search. Here boosting tree is a non-linear classifier which generates a conditional probability estimation for each instance. Since the first step is shared we only report the computational time for the second step, and the final testing utility in Table 2. In all experiments, Algorithm 1 is found to provide a comparable or better test performance with less computational time, for both linear and non-linear conditional probability estimators.

## 6.2 Online Algorithm

For all online experiments, we use Pegasos (Shalev-Shwartz et al., 2011) as our first step solver, so that it learns a linear classifier just like the competitors. We compare with two state-of-the-art algorithms STAMP/SPADE and SVM<sup>perf</sup>. Note that the convergence result for Pegasos (and most online classifier learners) is in terms of objective function, not in conditional probability or parameter estimation. Here we'll only illustrate empirically the gain in both utility and run time even without the theoretical guarantee of parameter consistency. For all methods the data is processed with a single pass for a fair comparison.

Table 3 lists the result of the experiments, where ‘-’ means the algorithm did not complete within time 100x longer compared to Algorithm 2. Figure 1 shows the test set performance after each step of training – to evaluate convergence w.r.t. run time. The one pass metric is calculated after a single pass of the data. In all experiments, it is clear that OCMO achieves the empirically superior performance fairly quickly, compared to SVM<sup>perf</sup> and STAMP/SPADE. STAMP/SPADE slows down with increasing dimension (the STAMP/SPADE experiments in (Narasimhan et al., 2015) are all conducted on low-dimensional datasets).

This efficiency advantage largely benefits from the design of first step solver (here Pegasos) for sparse input, whereas the competitor algorithms is not specifically designed for sparse inputs in its current form. It's worth noting that although there might be space for improvement, it requires non-trivial effort and different proofs of theoretical guarantees. In contrast, our approach adapts to the binary classification algorithm with minimal effort and easier to implement based on the current packages of existing CPE solvers.

## 7 Conclusion

We show in this paper the optimal classifier with respect to a large family of general classification measures is a thresholding function of the conditional probability, and the utility is strictly locally quasi-concave with respect to the threshold. Based on this knowledge, we present batch and online normalized gradient based algorithms for classification with general performance measures that can be easily combined with off-the-shell conditional probability estimation solvers, and show that under mild conditions, the proposed techniques enjoy strong statistical properties. In particular, the convergence rate of the batch algorithm is the same as the convergence rate of conditional probability estimator, and rate of online algorithm is the cumulative sum of the regret of online conditional probability estimator. We provide empirical evaluations of both algorithms as compared to recently published baselines, showing that the proposed techniques out-perform alternatives in practice, with better prediction performance improved computational complexity on a range of classification measures for large and high dimensional datasets.

## References

- F. R. Bach. Adaptivity of averaged stochastic gradient descent to local strong convexity for logistic regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):595–627, 2014.
- A. Beygelzimer, J. Langford, Y. Lifshits, G. Sorkin, and A. Strehl. Conditional probability tree estimation analysis and algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 51–58. AUAI Press, 2009.

- A. Buja, W. Stuetzle, and Y. Shen. Loss functions for binary class probability estimation and classification: Structure and applications. *Working draft, November, 2005*.
- R. Busa-Fekete, B. Szörényi, K. Dembczynski, and E. Hüllermeier. Online f-measure optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 595–603, 2015.
- L. Fahrmeir and H. Kaufmann. Consistency and asymptotic normality of the maximum likelihood estimator in generalized linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 342–368, 1985.
- E. Hazan, K. Levy, and S. Shalev-Shwartz. Beyond convexity: Stochastic quasi-convex optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1585–1593, 2015.
- D. Husmeier. *Neural networks for conditional probability estimation: Forecasting beyond point predictions*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- T. Joachims. A support vector method for multivariate performance measures. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on Machine learning*, pages 377–384. ACM, 2005.
- T. Joachims, T. Finley, and C.-N. J. Yu. Cutting-plane training of structural svms. *Machine Learning*, 77(1): 27–59, 2009.
- P. Kar, H. Narasimhan, and P. Jain. Online and stochastic gradient methods for non-decomposable loss functions. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 694–702, 2014.
- K. Kennedy, B. Mac Namee, and S. J. Delany. Learning without default: A study of one-class classification and the low-default portfolio problem. In *Artificial Intelligence and Cognitive Science*, pages 174–187. Springer, 2009.
- O. O. Koyejo, N. Natarajan, P. K. Ravikumar, and I. S. Dhillon. Consistent binary classification with generalized performance metrics. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2744–2752, 2014.
- C. D. Manning, P. Raghavan, H. Schütze, et al. *Introduction to information retrieval*, volume 1. Cambridge university press Cambridge, 2008.
- Y. Nan, K. M. Chai, W. S. Lee, and H. L. Chieu. Optimizing f-measure: A tale of two approaches. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1206.4625*, 2012.
- H. Narasimhan and S. Agarwal. On the relationship between binary classification, bipartite ranking, and binary class probability estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2913–2921, 2013.
- H. Narasimhan, R. Vaish, and S. Agarwal. On the statistical consistency of plug-in classifiers for non-decomposable performance measures. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1493–1501, 2014.
- H. Narasimhan, P. Kar, and P. Jain. Optimizing non-decomposable performance measures: A tale of two classes. In *32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2015.
- S. Negahban, B. Yu, M. J. Wainwright, and P. K. Ravikumar. A unified framework for high-dimensional analysis of  $m$ -estimators with decomposable regularizers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1348–1356, 2009.
- A. Ng and M. Jordan. On discriminative vs. generative classifiers: A comparison of logistic regression and naive bayes. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 14:841, 2002.
- S. Shalev-Shwartz, Y. Singer, N. Srebro, and A. Cotter. Pegasos: Primal estimated sub-gradient solver for svm. *Mathematical programming*, 127(1):3–30, 2011.

N. G. Ushakov. *Selected topics in characteristic functions*. Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

I.-C. Yeh and C.-h. Lien. The comparisons of data mining techniques for the predictive accuracy of probability of default of credit card clients. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(2):2473–2480, 2009.

M.-J. Zhao, N. Edakunni, A. Pocock, and G. Brown. Beyond fano’s inequality: bounds on the optimal f-score, ber, and cost-sensitive risk and their implications. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):1033–1090, 2013.

## Appendix

### A Proof of Theorem 1

*Proof.* We consider a continuous extension for the space of classifiers.

$$\mathcal{F} = \{f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto [-1, 1]\}$$

For any classifier  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\mu(X)$ , the marginal distribution of  $X$ , the confusion matrix is given by its entries: true positives (TP), false positives (FP), false negatives (FN) and true negatives (TN). These quantities can be represented in terms of expectation as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TP}(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = +1, f = +1) = \int \eta(x) \left[ \frac{1 + f(x)}{2} \right] d\mu \\ \text{FP}(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = -1, f = +1) = \int (1 - \eta(x)) \left[ \frac{1 + f(x)}{2} \right] d\mu \\ \text{FN}(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = +1, f = -1) = \int \eta(x) \left[ \frac{1 - f(x)}{2} \right] d\mu \\ \text{TN}(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = -1, f = -1) = \int (1 - \eta(x)) \left[ \frac{1 - f(x)}{2} \right] d\mu \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Let  $\pi = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1) = \int \eta(x) d\mu$  denote the marginal distribution of  $Y$ . By definition, the entries of the confusion matrix satisfy the following useful identities:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TP}(f) + \text{FN}(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = 1) = \pi \\ \text{FP}(f) + \text{TN}(f) &= \mathbb{P}(Y = -1) = 1 - \pi. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The confusion matrix is continuous and Frechét differentiable with respect to classifiers  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  with the derivatives given pointwise by:

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla \text{TP}(f)]_x &= \frac{1}{2} \eta(x) d\mu(x), \quad [\nabla \text{FP}(f)]_x = \frac{1}{2} (1 - \eta(x)) d\mu(x) \\ [\nabla \text{FN}(f)]_x &= -\frac{1}{2} \eta(x) d\mu(x), \quad [\nabla \text{TN}(f)]_x = -\frac{1}{2} (1 - \eta(x)) d\mu(x) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Taking constraint (6) into consideration, it follows wlog. that for a fixed  $P$ , there exists a two parameter representation for any  $\mathcal{U}$  given by  $\mathcal{G} : [0, 1]^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  where:

$$\mathcal{U}(f, P) \equiv \mathcal{U}(\text{TP}, \text{FP}, \text{FN}, \text{TN}) = \mathcal{G}(\text{TP}, \text{TN}).$$

Let  $g_1 = \partial \mathcal{G} / \partial \text{TP}$ ,  $g_2 = \partial \mathcal{G} / \partial \text{TN}$ , and note that  $g_1, g_2$  depend on the classifier  $f$  via the confusion matrix. Applying the chain rule, the Frechét derivative may be computed as:

$$\begin{aligned} [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f)]_x &= [\nabla \mathcal{G}(\text{TP}(f), \text{TN}(f), \pi)]_x \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [g_1(f) \eta(x) - g_2(f) (1 - \eta(x))] d\mu \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (g_1 + g_2) \left( \eta(x) - \frac{g_2}{g_1 + g_2} \right) d\mu \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Let  $c_1(f) = \frac{1}{2}(g_1(f) + g_2(f))$ ,  $c_2(f) = \frac{g_2(f)}{g_1(f) + g_2(f)}$ , so we may define  $c_1^* = c_1(f^*)$ ,  $c_2^* = c_2(f^*)$ . It follows that  $[\nabla \mathcal{U}(f)]_x = c_1(f)(\eta(x) - c_2(f)) d\mu(x)$ .

Since  $\mathcal{U}$  is concave, the first order optimality condition holds for any optimal point  $f^*$ :  $\langle \nabla \mathcal{U}(f^*), f^* - f \rangle \geq 0$ ,  $\forall f \in \mathcal{F}$ , which is equivalent to:

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f^*)]_x (f^*(x) - f(x)) \geq 0, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F}.$$

For any  $f \in \mathcal{F}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}$  can be decomposed into three mutually exclusive subsets:  $A_1(f) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f)]_x > 0\}$ ,  $A_2(f) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f)]_x < 0\}$ ,  $A_3(f) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f)]_x = 0\}$  and it's easily seen that  $A_1(f) \cup A_2(f) \cup A_3(f) = \mathcal{X}$ . Based on our decomposition, the integral on  $\mathcal{X}$  can be decomposed into two parts corresponding to  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{A_1 \cup A_2} [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f^*)]_x (f^*(x) - f(x)) \geq 0 \\ \iff & \int_{A_1} [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f^*)]_x (f^*(x) - f(x)) + \int_{A_2} [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f^*)]_x (f^*(x) - f(x)) \geq 0, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{F} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

We now claim  $f^*(x) = 1$  on  $A_1$  and  $f^*(x) = -1$  on  $A_2$ . To see this, note that for any optimal point  $f^*$ , if there exists a subset  $U \subset \mathcal{X}$  on which it fails to satisfy the claim, without loss of generality, assume  $U \subset A_1^*$ , we are going to show  $\mu(U) = 0$ . By assumption,  $f^*(x) < 1$  on  $U$ . Let  $f(x) = \mathbb{I}_U(x) + f^* \mathbb{I}_{U^c}(x)$ , and plug it into (9), we have

$$\int_U [\nabla \mathcal{U}(f^*)]_x (f^*(x) - 1) \geq 0$$

The integrand is strictly negative so  $\mu(U) = 0$ . Thus,  $f^*(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x \in A_1^* \\ -1 & x \in A_2^* \end{cases}$  holds a.e. Now note if  $P(A_3^*) = 0$ , when  $c_1^* > 0$ ,  $A_1^* = \{x : \eta(x) > c_2^*\}$  and  $A_2^* = \{x : \eta(x) < c_2^*\}$ , which corresponds to a threshold form for the classifier. The result for  $c_1^* < 0$  holds similarly.  $\square$

## Proof of Lemma 2

*Proof.* By assumption,  $\eta(x)$  is a continuous and differentiable function wrt  $x$ , therefore the density of random variable  $\eta(X)$  exists. We denote it as  $p_\eta(x)$ . When  $f = \text{sign}(\eta(x) - \delta)$ , we could conduct the change of variable  $u = \eta(x)$  and have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{TP}(f) &= \int_{\{x: \eta(x) > \delta\}} \eta(x) p_X(x) dx = \int_{u=\delta}^{\infty} u \frac{p_\eta(u)}{\eta'(x)} \eta'(x) dx = \int_{\delta}^{\infty} u p_\eta(u) du \\ \text{TN}(f) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\delta} (1 - u) p_\eta(u) du \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

By Leibniz integral rule, we can take the partial derivative of it w.r.t.  $\delta$ . Note that the integrand is not a function of  $\delta$ , hence

$$\frac{\partial \text{TP}(f)}{\partial \delta} = -\delta p_\eta(\delta), \quad \frac{\partial \text{TN}(f)}{\partial \delta} = (1 - \delta) p_\eta(\delta) \quad (11)$$

Therefore when  $\mathcal{G}$  follows the assumptions as in Theorem 1, the gradient of  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to  $\delta$  can be derived by chain rule,

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{U}(f)}{\partial \delta} = (-\delta g_1(\text{TP}, \text{TN}) + (1 - \delta) g_2(\text{TP}, \text{TN})) p_\eta(\delta). \quad (12)$$

$\square$

## B Proof of Lemma 3

*Proof.* By Lemma 2,

$$[\nabla \mathcal{U}(\delta)]_x = p_\eta(x)(g_2(\delta) - (g_1(\delta) + g_2(\delta))\delta)$$

When  $\delta = 0$ ,  $[\nabla \mathcal{U}(\delta)]_x = p_\eta(x)g_2(\delta) \geq 0$ , and for those  $x : p_\eta(x) > 0$ ,  $[\nabla \mathcal{U}(\delta)]_x > 0$ . Similarly,  $[\nabla \mathcal{U}(\delta)]_x = -p_\eta(x)g_1(\delta) \leq 0$ , and for those  $x : p_\eta(x) > 0$ ,  $[\nabla \mathcal{U}(\delta)]_x < 0$ . Therefore by the continuity of  $\nabla \mathcal{U}$ , such  $\rho_0$  exists and  $\delta^*$  cannot lie in  $[0, \rho_0]$  or  $(1 - \rho_0, 1]$ .

Now we show that  $\mathcal{U}$  is Lipschitz within the interval  $[\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]$ . By writing the density of  $Z_1 = \eta(X)$  as Fourier transform of its characteristic function, it is always bounded:

$$p_\eta(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-iux} \phi_1(u) du \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\phi_1(u)| du = K/(2\pi)$$

Then by Assumption 1,  $g_1, g_2$  are bounded in the closed interval  $[\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]$ . So we have  $\forall \delta \in [\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]$ .

$$|\nabla \mathcal{U}| \leq \frac{K}{2\pi} \sup_{\delta \in [\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]} \{g_1(\delta), g_2(\delta)\} \leq \frac{KM}{2\pi}.$$

Now it remains to show  $\mathcal{U}$  is SLQC. By definiton, it suffices to show that for any  $x \in [\rho_0, 1 - \rho_0]$  and  $|\mathcal{U}(x) - \mathcal{U}(\delta^*)| > \epsilon$ , the following holds:

$$\langle \nabla \mathcal{U}(x), y - x \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in B(\delta^*, \frac{2\pi\epsilon}{KM})$$

By Lipschitz condition,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nabla \mathcal{U}(x), y - x \rangle &= \langle \nabla \mathcal{U}(x), y - \delta^* \rangle + \langle \nabla \mathcal{U}(x), \delta^* - x \rangle \\ &\geq \langle \nabla \mathcal{U}(x), y - \delta^* \rangle + \frac{2\pi}{KM} |\nabla \mathcal{U}(x)| (\mathcal{U}(\delta^*) - \mathcal{U}(x)) \\ &\geq \frac{2\pi\epsilon}{KM} |\nabla \mathcal{U}(x)| - |y - \delta^*| \cdot |\nabla \mathcal{U}(x)| \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## C Proof of Theorem 2

By triangular inequality and locally Lipschitz condition, when  $(\text{TP}, \text{TN}) \in B_\epsilon(\text{TP}^*, \text{TN}^*)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{U}(\eta, \delta) - \mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\delta})| &\leq |\mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \delta) - \mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\delta})| + |\mathcal{U}(\eta, \delta) - \mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \delta)| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \delta) - \mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\delta})| + |\mathcal{G}(\text{TP}^*, \text{TN}^*) - \mathcal{G}(\text{TP}(\hat{\eta}, \delta), \text{TN}(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\delta}))| \\ &\leq |\mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \delta) - \mathcal{U}(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\delta})| + L \|(\text{TP}^* - \text{TP}(\hat{\eta}, \delta), \text{TN}^* - \text{TN}(\hat{\eta}, \hat{\delta}))\|_2 \\ &:= \text{I} + \text{II} \end{aligned}$$

We first bound II and show I is of a smaller order when we run the algorithm long enough. By our claim, it's suffice to show  $|\text{TP}(\hat{\eta}, \delta) - \text{TP}(\eta, \delta)| \leq C \int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu$ , the upper bound of TN can be shown similarly. Note here that in estimated  $\text{TP}(\hat{\delta}, \delta)$ , the integrand in calculating this quantity is still the true  $\eta$ . To avoid confusion we expand both terms and work with the integral. Define  $\delta_{\text{part}}$  as

$$\mathbb{P}(\{X : \hat{\eta}(X) < \delta_{\text{part}}\}) = \mathbb{P}(\{X : \eta(X) < \delta\}). \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
|\text{TP}^* - \text{TP}(\hat{\eta}, \delta)| &\leq \left| \int_{\hat{\eta} > \delta} \eta(x) d\mu - \int_{\eta > \delta} \eta(x) d\mu \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_{\hat{\eta} > \delta_{\text{part}}} \eta(x) d\mu - \int_{\eta > \delta} \eta(x) d\mu \right| + \left| \int_{\min(\delta, \delta_{\text{part}}) < \hat{\eta} < \max(\delta, \delta_{\text{part}})} \eta(x) d\mu \right| \\
&\leq \left| \int_{\hat{\eta} > \delta_{\text{part}}} \eta(x) d\mu - \int_{\eta > \delta} \eta(x) d\mu \right| + |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta} < \delta) - \mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta} < \delta_{\text{part}})| \\
&\leq \left| \int_{\hat{\eta} > \delta_{\text{part}}} \hat{\eta} d\mu - \int_{\eta > \delta} \eta(x) d\mu \right| + \int_{\hat{\eta} > \delta_{\text{part}}} |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu + |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta} < \delta) - \mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta} < \delta_{\text{part}})| \\
&= \text{II.A} + \text{II.B} + \text{II.C}
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Note II.B is immediately upper bounded by  $\int |\eta - \hat{\eta}| d\mu$ , now we'll bound II.A and II.C respectively.

**Bounding II.A** We bound II.A when two partitions of the same size are applied by the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.** *For any conditional probability  $\eta$  and its estimator  $\hat{\eta}$ , let  $\delta_{\text{part}}$  defined by Eq. (13). Then  $\left| \int_{\hat{\eta} > \delta_{\text{part}}} \hat{\eta} d\mu - \int_{\eta > \delta} \eta(x) d\mu \right| \leq \int_{\mathcal{X}} |\eta - \hat{\eta}| d\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Define a partition based on Eq. (13).

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \{X : \hat{\eta}(X) < \delta_{\text{part}}, \eta(X) > \delta\}, \quad A_2 = \{X : \hat{\eta}(X) > \delta_{\text{part}}, \eta(X) < \delta\} \\
A_3 &= \{X : \hat{\eta}(X) > \delta_{\text{part}}, \eta(X) > \delta\}, \quad A_4 = \{X : \hat{\eta}(X) < \delta_{\text{part}}, \eta(X) < \delta\}
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

By definition of  $\delta_{\text{part}}$ ,  $P(A_1 \cup A_3) = P(\eta > \delta) = P(\hat{\eta} > \delta_{\text{part}}) = P(A_2 \cup A_3)$ , hence  $P(A_1) = P(A_2)$ . Now II.A can be represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{A_2 \cup A_3} \hat{\eta} d\mu - \int_{A_1 \cup A_3} \eta d\mu &= \int_{A_2} \hat{\eta}(x) d\mu - \int_{A_1} \eta d\mu + \int_{A_3} (\hat{\eta} - \eta) d\mu \\
&\leq \int_{A_2} \hat{\eta}(x) d\mu - \int_{A_2} \eta d\mu + \int_{A_3} (\hat{\eta} - \eta) d\mu \\
&\leq \int_{A_2 \cup A_3} |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality is due to the fact that  $\int_{A_1} \eta d\mu \geq \delta P(A_1) = \delta P(A_2) \geq \int_{A_2} \eta d\mu$ . On the other hand, if we notice  $\int_{A_1} \hat{\eta} d\mu \leq \delta_{\text{part}} P(A_1) = \delta_{\text{part}} P(A_2) \leq \int_{A_2} \hat{\eta} d\mu$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{A_2 \cup A_3} \hat{\eta} d\mu - \int_{A_1 \cup A_3} \eta d\mu &\geq \int_{A_1} \hat{\eta}(x) d\mu - \int_{A_1} \eta d\mu + \int_{A_3} (\hat{\eta} - \eta) d\mu \\
&\geq - \int_{A_1 \cup A_3} |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu
\end{aligned}$$

Combining both sides proves the lemma.  $\square$

**Bounding II.C** By definition of  $\delta_{\text{part}}$ ,  $|\mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta} < \delta) - \mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta} < \delta_{\text{part}})| = |\mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta}(X) < \delta) - \mathbb{P}(\eta(X) < \delta)|$ . Define two random variables  $Z_1 = \eta(X)$  and  $Z_2 = \hat{\eta}(X)$ , the right hand side corresponds to the Kolmogorov-Smirnov distance between the distributions of  $Z_1$  and  $Z_2$ . We recall the definition below, let  $F_1, F_2$  be the cumulative density function of  $Z_1, Z_2$  respectively.

$$KS(F_1, F_2) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_1(x) - F_2(x)|$$

The KS distance has close connection to the distances between characteristic functions. To be explicit, we cite the following lemma.

**Lemma 7** (Ushakov (1999) Theorem 2.9.3). *Let  $F_1(x)$  and  $F_2(x)$  be two distribution functions with characteristic functions  $\phi_1(t)$  and  $\phi_2(t)$ . Then for any positive  $T$ , the following inequality is true.*

$$KS(F_1, F_2) \leq \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-T}^T \left| \frac{\phi_1(t) - \phi_2(t)}{t} \right| dt + \frac{1}{2T} \int_{-T}^T (|\phi_1(t)| + |\phi_2(t)|) dt$$

The following lemma bounds the difference of probabilities of two thresholding classifiers with same threshold being positive.

**Proposition 1.** *Consider two conditional probability functions  $Z_1 = \eta(X)$  and  $Z_2 = \hat{\eta}(X)$  of random variable  $X$ , and  $\delta \in [0, 1]$ . If the characteristic functions of  $Z_1, Z_2$  are  $\phi_1(t)$  and  $\phi_2(t)$  respectively, and  $\phi_1, \phi_2$  are both absolutely integrable, then  $\forall \delta \in [0, 1]$ ,*

$$|\mathbb{P}(\eta(X) > \delta) - \mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta}(X) > \delta)| \leq C \int |\eta - \hat{\eta}| d\mu.$$

*Proof.* When  $\phi_1(t), \phi_2(t)$  are absolutely integrable,  $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-T}^T (|\phi_1(t)| + |\phi_2(t)|) dt < \infty$ . So by Lemma 7 as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} KS(F_1, F_2) &\leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-T}^T \left| \frac{\phi_1(t) - \phi_2(t)}{t} \right| dt \\ &\leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-T}^T \left| \frac{\mathbb{E}(e^{it\eta(X)}) - \mathbb{E}(e^{it\hat{\eta}(X)})}{t} \right| dt \\ &\leq \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-T}^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \frac{\cos(t\eta) - \cos(t\hat{\eta}) + i \sin(t\eta) - i \sin(t\hat{\eta})}{t} \right| \right] dt \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\cos(t\eta) - \cos(t\hat{\eta})| + |\sin(t\eta) - \sin(t\hat{\eta})|}{t} dt \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \mathbb{E} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|2 \sin(t(\eta - \hat{\eta})/2) \sin(t(\eta + \hat{\eta})/2) + 2 |\sin(t(\eta - \hat{\eta})/2) \cos(t(\eta + \hat{\eta})/2)|}{t} dt \\ &\leq \frac{4}{\pi} \mathbb{E} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\sin(t(\eta - \hat{\eta})/2)|}{t} dt \\ &\leq C \int |\eta - \hat{\eta}| d\mu \end{aligned}$$

The equality is built on the trigonometric identities. The inequality before that is due to the fact that characteristic function and KS distance are both finite, so we can change the order of integration and expectation.  $\square$

**Bounding I** Now it remains to bound I. By Lemma 1, normalized gradient descent convergences with proper choice of  $T$  and  $\alpha$ . Lemma 3 shows that the objective function is SLQC, therefore by the choice of stepsize and number of iterations, the algorithm converges to the global optimal point.

By Lemma 3 and 1, if we initialize at  $\delta_0 = 0.5$ , then  $\|\delta^* - \delta_0\| \leq 1/2$ . Take  $\epsilon = o(\int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu)$ , with  $T \geq \frac{K^2 M^2}{16\pi \int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu}$  and  $\alpha \leq \frac{2\pi \int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu}{KM}$ , we have  $I \leq o(\int |\hat{\eta} - \eta| d\mu)$ .

The proof is complete by combining all pieces together.

## D Proof of Theorem 3

We first decompose the regret into two parts, divergence in  $\eta$  and divergence in  $\delta$ .

$$|\mathcal{U}^* - \mathcal{U}(\eta_t, \delta_t)| \leq |\mathcal{G}(\text{TP}^*, \text{TN}^*) - \mathcal{G}(\text{TP}_t, \text{TN}_t)| + |\mathcal{U}(\eta_t, \delta^*) - \mathcal{U}(\eta_t, \delta_t)|$$

The second term is controlled by the NGD in the inner loops. As we show in Lemma 3 that  $\mathcal{U}$  given any  $\hat{\eta}$  is  $(\epsilon, \frac{KM}{2\pi})$ -SLQC, therefore taking  $T_t \geq \frac{K^2 M^2}{16\pi r_t^2}$  and stepsize  $\alpha = \frac{2\pi\epsilon}{KM}$  ensures  $|\mathcal{U}(\eta_t, \delta^*) - \mathcal{U}(\eta_t, \delta_t)| \leq r_t$ .

For the first term, note that  $\text{TP}_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t 1(\eta_t(x_i) \geq \delta_t)$ , and  $\mathbb{E}\text{TP}_t = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbb{P}(\eta_t \geq \delta_t)$ . By the proof of Theorem 2,  $|\mathbb{P}(\eta_t \geq \delta_t) - \mathbb{P}(\eta \geq \delta)| \leq r_t$ . Therefore we have  $|\text{TP}_t - \text{TP}^*| \leq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t r_t}{t}$ . This combined with the Lipschitzness of  $\mathcal{G}$  completes the result.

## E Proofs in Section 5

### Proof of Lemma 4

*Proof.* By Theorem 1, all we need to do is to plug in the probability density of  $X$  to calculate  $\eta(x)$ .

$$\eta(x) - \delta^* > 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\exp(\langle \beta, x \rangle)}{1 + \exp(\langle \beta, x \rangle)} > \delta^* \iff \langle \beta, x \rangle - \log \frac{\delta^*}{1 - \delta^*} > 0 \quad (16)$$

□

### Proof of Lemma 5

*Proof.* For ease of notation, we use  $C$  to represent any constant that doesn't depend on the parameters, which may vary from line to line. When  $Y|X$  is from logistic regression, all we need to show is that  $\int \frac{e^{\beta^T x}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x}} d\mu$  has bounded gradient w.r.t.  $\beta$ .

$$\left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \int \frac{e^{\beta^T x}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x}} d\mu \right| = \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \int \frac{e^{\beta^T x}}{1 + e^{\beta^T x}} d\mu \right| = \left| \int \frac{e^{\beta^T x} \cdot x}{(1 + e^{\beta^T x})^2} d\mu \right| \leq \left| \int x d\mu \right| = |\mathbb{E}X| \quad (17)$$

The claim is proved. □

## F Additional Experiments

### F.1 Synthetic Experiments

In this paragraph, we use some synthetic logistic regression data to justify our batch Algorithm 1 and show the consistency in both the metric and the threshold. The training data is generated from multivariate Gaussian. The response is generated from a logistic model with random weights. The performance is evaluated on a same testing set, which shares the same model parameters as the training data. We calculate the Bayes optimal classifier by using the ground truth parameters and exhaustively search the best threshold. We use logistic regression as our first step solver.

Figure 2 compares our algorithm with Bayes optimal, plug-in method, and the online algorithm by Narasimhan et al. (2015), with increasing sample size, where Bayes optimal is calculated by plug-in the ground-truth and exhaustively find the optimal threshold. For the online algorithm, since we're comparing the performance based on finite samples, we calculate the curve for both single pass of the data and multiple passes, in this case, 100 passes.

From Figure 2, Algorithm 1 has a faster convergence rate compared to other methods. When sample size is small, plug-in approach only needs to search over a small number of points so it's faster than gradient




Figure 2: Synthetic data under low dimension setting




Figure 3: Generalization Utility under high dimension setting

approach. From panel (e) and (f) we could see the convergence in threshold. Notably, STAMP for F-measure will diverge under many cases, while Algorithm 1 doesn't have such limitation.

For regularized high dimensional cases, both Algorithm 1 and online algorithms share the same convergence rate of  $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})$  and require larger sample size to converge, but multiple passes are needed to achieve comparable performance. See Figure 3 for comparison in both performance and computational time. The last two panels




Figure 4: Performance vs time for various online algorithms

show a better threshold convergence for Algorithm 1 compared to plug-in approach, which provides better interpretation power to the model.

As the sample size grows, the multiple passes become very expensive, the  $O(n^2)$  complexity of plug-in approach starts to suffer. In this case, the computational advantage of Algorithm 1 is significant.

## F.2 More online experiments of benchmark datasets

We provide a full list of figures on the convergence of various online algorithms on different datasets. See Figure 4. Note for both KDD 2010 data (as we call it kdda and kddb), the labels are highly imbalanced, this brings down the Q-Mean measure as it's very sensitive when one of the TP and TN are close to 0.